



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,355	10/23/2003	Dan Dwyer	200312262	2726

22879 7590 10/17/2005

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

KOVAL, MELISSA J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2851

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

21

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/693,355	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DWYER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Melissa J. Koval	<b>Art Unit</b> 2851	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21,23-29 and 31-71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13,15,17,18,28,38,41,44,45,48,52,53,55 and 56 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 20,21,23-29,31-37,39,40,68 and 69 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12,14,16,19,42,43,46,49-51,54,57-68,70 and 71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 47 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14, 16, 42, 43, 46, 49-54, 57-61, 66, 67, 70 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Howell et al. U.S. Patent 6,443,574 B1.

See Figures 1 and Figure 3B, for example.

Claim 1 sets forth: "A multimedia display device comprising:

a docking station (See docking bracket 22 in Fig. 1 or docking station 210 in Figure 3B.) including speakers (See vehicle speakers 48 in Figure 1 or speakers 220 in Figure 3B.) and a media drive (Information storage and retrieval device 12 including removable storage medium 24 in Figure 1 or entertainment device 202 in Figure 3B.);

wherein said docking station is configured to structurally and communicatively couple an image projection device to said docking station (Video display screen 14 of Figure 1 and a similar video display screen shown in Figure 3B constitute a rear projection device.)."

Claim 2 sets forth: "The multimedia display device of claim 1, wherein said docking station further comprises an electrical interconnect." See electronics 18 and terminals 34 of Figure 1.

Claim 3 sets forth: "The multimedia display device of claim 2, wherein said image

Art Unit: 2851

projection device is coupled to said docking station through said electrical interconnect.”

See column 5, lines 50 through 64, wherein pins 162 and electrical connector 166 are described.

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected for the same reasons described in the rejections of claims 2 and 3.

With respect to claim 6, see column 2, lines 60 through 67 and column 3, lines 1 through 7.

With respect to claims 8 and 9, see electrical connectors 44 in Figure 1. The user pushes buttons to control the device.

With respect to claim 10, the figures show a handle disposed on the housing that slides into the docking bracket, however the handle has not been given a reference numeral.

With respect to claim 11, see column 3, lines 7 through 16.

With respect to claim 12, see Figures 1 and 3C.

With respect to claim 14 the cavity of housing 20, supports video display screen 14 in both horizontal and vertical directions. See column 4, lines 21 through 31.

With respect to claim 16, see speakers 220 shown in Figure 3B.

With respect to claim 71, See column 5, lines 13 through 23.

Claims 42, 43, 46, 49, 50, 51, 54, and 57-61 are met by the teaching of Howell et al. for the reasons already given above.

With respect to claims 66, 67 and 70, again refer to the Figures.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12, 14, 16, 19, 49-51, 54, and 57-66 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Derryberry (U.S. Patent 6,626,543 B1).

See Figures 7, 8 and 9, for example, of Derryberry ('543 B2). It can be understood from the "DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION" that the electronic image projection device of Derryberry is a multi-media device.

Claim 1 sets forth: "A multimedia display device comprising:  
a docking station including speakers (See column 3, lines 64 through 66.) and a media drive (See column 5, lines 21 through 27, for media drives A and B.);  
wherein said docking station (network docking station 42) is configured to structurally and communicatively couple an image projection device to said docking station (docking station connections 40)."

Note that the embodiment of Figure 11, the projector 10 can also serve as a docking station. See column 5, lines 54 through 67.

Therefore the invention of Derryberry '543 B1 can meet the limitations of claim 1 in more than one way if one embodiment is modified in view of another embodiment taught by '543 B1. If for example, in the embodiment shown in Figure 8 the projector includes speakers as suggested by the teaching of column 3, lines 64 through 66, the

docking station does include speakers by means of the projector. As a second example, if the projector 10 shown in the embodiment of Figure 11 includes speaker, the docking station is the projector for receiving the media drive. In either case, the elements are structurally and communicatively coupled and any patentable distinction in the claim language over Derryberry is not clear, and it would at least have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that the time the invention was made that a multimedia device including a projection device, speakers and a docking system is well known in the art. The motivation for one to modify one embodiment over another to meet said limitations is found in the teaching of Derryberry '543 B1 as discussed above.

Claim 2 sets forth: "The multimedia display device of claim 1, wherein said docking station further comprises an electrical interconnect." See column 5, lines 51 through 57. Claim 3 is rejected for the same reasons applied to rejected claim 2.

Claim 4 sets forth: "The multimedia display device of claim 1, wherein said image projection device receives a video signal from said docking station via said electrical interconnect." See column 5, lines 24 and 25.

Claim 5 sets forth: "The multimedia display device of claim 4, wherein said video signal from said docking station is in synch with an audio signal output by said speakers of said docking station."

Derryberry ('543 B2) does not use the term "in synch" in the body of his specification. However the examiner believes that the limitations of claim 5 do not patentably distinguish the claim over Derryberry. For example, Derryberry refers to a DVD drive in column 3, line 51. If the DVD image projected is not in synch with the

accompanying audio, the device is not working properly and the viewer's viewing experience would be disorienting. Or, for example, the presentation referred to in column 3, lines 64 and 65 would have a similar effect on viewers of the presentation if the audio is not in synch with video. Viewers would be confused and subjected to an unpleasant and unintelligible viewing experience.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made that video and audio signals are in synch for the claimed system. The motivation for designing the system as such would be so that the system achieves its desired function for both the operator and the viewer or viewers.

Claim 6 sets forth: "The multimedia display device of claim 1, wherein said media drive comprises one of a compact disc read-only memory (CD-ROM) drive, a recordable (CD-R) drive, a rewritable CD (CD-RW) drive, a digital versatile disc read-only memory (DO-ROM) drive, a recordable DVD (DVD+R) drive, a rewritable DVD (DVD+RW) drive, a motion picture entertainment group compression format number three (MP3) drive, a DVD/CD/CDRW/MP3 combination drive, a cassette drive, a memory stick, a memory card slot, a hard disk device, or an M receiver." See column 3, lines 50 through 52.

Claim 7 sets forth: "The multimedia display device of claim 1, wherein said docking station further comprises an infrared (I/R) sensor configured to receive control commands from a remote control." See column 3, lines 41 and 42.

Claim 8 sets forth: "The multimedia display device of claim 7, wherein said control commands are delivered to said image projection device through said docking station to control said image projection device." See column 3, lines 53 through 56.

Refer to Figures 1 and 3 of Derryberry, for example.

Claim 9 sets forth: "The multimedia display device of claim 1, wherein said docking station further comprises a plurality of control buttons configured to control an operation of said docking station." See power button 24 and reset button 26.

Claim 10 sets forth: "The multimedia display device of claim 1, further comprising a handle disposed on said docking station." Refer to Figures 6 through 8 of Derryberry and handle 38. Also see column 4, lines 54 through 57.

Claim 11 sets forth: "The multimedia display device of claim 1, wherein said image projection device comprises one of a liquid crystal display (LCD) projector, a digital light processing (DLP) projector, a liquid crystal on silicon (LCOS) projector, a slide projector, or a film projector." See column 3, lines 43 through 46.

Claim 12 sets forth: The multimedia display device of claim 1, wherein said docking station further comprises:

- a body; and

- a cavity disposed in said body;

wherein said cavity is configured to structurally support said image projection device. See Figures 7 and 8. Network docking station 42 is shown to have a body and a cavity for receiving projector 10 housed in projector housing 12.

Claim 14 sets forth: "The multimedia display device of claim 12, wherein said cavity is configured to support said image projection device in a horizontal position. Again see Figures 7 and 8, for example.

Claim 16 sets forth: "The multimedia display device of claim 1, wherein said speakers comprise two speakers configured to provide stereo sound." Again refer to column 3, lines 64 and 65, wherein Derryberry teaches, "The projection device and/or the computer device could utilize speakers to present audio information." Therefore the reference teaches the presence of plural speakers, but does not specifically state "two speakers" as claimed. The examiner does not believe that the number of speakers used achieves unexpected results and many audio devices utilize two speakers. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize two speakers because the reference implies the presence of at least two speakers as described above. The motivation for one having ordinary skill in the art to use two speakers would be to provide sound to the viewer's left and right ears equally. Claim 37 is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 19 sets forth: "The multimedia display device of claim 1, wherein said docking station further comprises an indicator configured to notify a user when said image projection device is correctly coupled to said docking station." See power button 24, drives A and B, and display screen 18. Once the power button is on, the failure of the drives or the display screen to operate would indicate the failure of electrical connectivity among the docked devices.

Claims 49 through 51, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, and 61 are rejected for reasons already applied to the above rejected claims.

Claim 62 sets forth: "The image projector of claim 59, wherein said electrical

connection comprises one of a universal serial bus (USB), a small computer system interface (SCSI), a Bluetooth connection, an VEE 1394 high speed serial bus, a parallel connection, a serial connection, a radio corporation of America (RCA) connector, a coaxial cable connector, a fiber optic connector, or a wireless connector." See column 3, lines 53 through 56, of Derryberry ('543 B2).

With respect to claims 63 through 65, the teaching of Derryberry is silent to the shape of the speakers that may be used, suggesting that the device could make use of any shaped speakers.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use round speakers with the device taught by Dewberry, as nothing in applicant's specification suggests that the shape of the speakers are critical. The motivation for one having ordinary skill in the art to use one shape of speaker over another shape would be purely cosmetic.

With respect to claim 66, refer to the embodiment of Figure 8 in view of the arguments already applied to rejected claim 1.

Claim 68 is rejected for the same reasons already applied to claim 19.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed August 3, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. On page 17, applicant argues the rejection of claim 1 as though claim 1 also includes the limitation of claim 67. Although the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103 in view of Derryberry is maintained, Applicant's remarks with respect to claim 67 were convincing. Thus the rejection of claim 67 under 35 USC 103 in view of

Derryberry was not maintained. The Examiner disputes the following remarks set forth by Applicant on page 17: "Derryberry does not anywhere teach or suggest that speakers could be incorporated into the docking station 42 as claimed."

The following is disclosed in column 3, lines 64 and 65 of Derryberry '543 B2: "The projection device and/or the computer device could utilize speakers to present audio information." The Examiner asserts that this gives one of ordinary skill in the art motivation to modify the structure of Derryberry to meet the limitations of claim 1.

Furthermore, on the top of page 18 of his remarks, Applicant states the following:

"On this point, the recent Office Action points out that in Fig. 11 of Derryberry, the projector 10 can also serve as a docking station. (Office Action of 5/9/05, p. 2). However, this is inapplicable to claim 1. Claim 1 recites a docking station that is configured to receive the image projection not *be* the image projection device. This arrangement provides advantages not available in the prior art. As explained in Applicant's specification this allows "the docking station (120) illustrated in Figure IB [to] function as a standalone audio system when it is not coupled to an image projection device (110; Fig, 1A)." Derryberry does not teach or suggest any device arranged so as to produce this advantage of the claimed device. Again, the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims based on Derryberry should be reconsidered and withdrawn."

The Examiner points out that the rejection is under 35 USC 103 in view of Derryberry, not 35 USC 102, therefore Applicant has failed to argue why the distinctions between Derryberry and the claimed invention are not obvious with respect to independent claim 1 and also independent claims 12, 49, and 58.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 20, 21, 23 through 29, 31 through 37, 39, 40, 68, and 69 are allowed.

Claim 47 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Laughlin U.S. Patent 5,847,748 teaches a multimedia projection system.

Johnson U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2005/0083486 A1 teaches a portable multimedia projection system.

Denmeade U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2004/0017548 A1 teaches a digital media source integral with microprocessor, image projection device and audio components.

Denmeade WO 03/079678 A1 teaches a digital media source integral with microprocessor, image projection device and audio component as self-contained system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melissa J. Koval whose telephone number is (571) 272-2121. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJK

*Handwritten signature: Melisa Kovach*